SINGLE BENCH

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH
BILASPUR

Writ Petition (C) No. 6674 / 2006

Petitioner/ Smt. Nisha Agrawal, 39 Years
JD No. 3 W/o Niranjan Agrawal, MIG 366,
Sec. 1, Dindayal UP Nagar, Raipur

P.R. No. 6684/06
Presented on 23/11/06
dated

VERSUS

Respondents/ 1. Nima Marketing Enterprise,
DH & 3 JDs *Prop. Concern of Nirma Consumer Care Ltd.*, Regd. Office @ Basement Nirma House, Ashram Road, Ahmedabad
2. M/s. Jai Ambey Agency, Partnership Firm
3. Niranjan Agrawal
4. Ramlal Agrawal

Petitioner and 3-4 are partner of 2.

2-4 C/o Sukhram-Mulchand Building, Jorapara, Fulchowk, Raipur

NOTARY GOVT. OF CHHATTISGARH. H.C. SHARMA NOTARY (VOLUNTARY) RAIPUR (C.G.) INDIA Regd. No. 10/14 23-12-2002 NO 2006

PETITION U/ART. 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION

XI-HC-22

(98)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक ...WP(C) 6674/06... **सन्** / **200**

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	12.12.2006 On being mentioned, the matter is taken-up for hearing. Shri Raja Sharma, counsel for the petitioner. None for the respondents. Heard. Petitioner has questioned validity of the application filed by the decree holder under Order XXI, Rule 66 of the CPC and order dated 28.10.2006. Petitioner was given opportunity to contest the application, but, he did not even file his reply. Therefore, in the absence of his reply, the application filed by the decree holder was allowed and attached property was ordered to be sold by public auction. In these circumstances, no error appears to be committed by the executing Court on the record that requires any interference. However, if the petitioner has any grievance regarding the application filed by the decree holder, she may raise her objections in appropriate manner before the executing Court. With the aforesaid direction, the petition is disposed of. Certified copy as per rules. **Sd/-** **Vijay Kumar Shrivastava** **Judge**	

padma

(पीछे देखिये)